



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

theories are also contained in this literature, and appear there free from some of the complications of modern controversy.

There is, however, a serious limitation to the value of the material collected in this dissertation, a limitation recognized by the author himself and frankly stated by him (10, 106, etc.). Most of the writers from whom he quotes were philosophers, who had little knowledge of, or interest in, what we should call business. Many of them had an aristocratic prejudice against business or money-making of any sort, as well as against manual labor in industrial occupations or even on the land: others affected to despise wealth altogether. For this reason the philosophers as a class were theorists without practical knowledge of economic problems, and discussed conditions as they believed they should be, not as they actually were. They do not represent fairly the opinions or the judgment of the business men of their time. A knowledge of Greek economics must be derived not so much from the theoretical discussions of the philosophers as from the incidental references to such matters in the writings of the orators and other ancient authors.

In conclusion, it must be said that Dr. Trever's terms and phrases are sometimes carelessly chosen. For example, he constantly translates Aristotle's term *χρηματιστική*, which includes *καπηλική* ('retail trade'), by the English term "finance" (111 f.). He translates *τῶν μελίστων δοκούντων* by "of the best classes" (136). He speaks of "allowing the effect of demand to *overcome* unduly the cost of production", where he probably means 'overbalance'.

PRINCETON UNIVERSITY.

WILLIAM K. PRENTICE.

ANCIENT FISHES

An article which may well prove of interest to many students of the Classics was contributed to Science, 46.228-231, September 7, 1917, by Mr. C. R. Eastman, of The American Museum of Natural History, New York City, under the title Fish Names, Ancient and Modern, and Early Illustrations of Fishes. The article does not confine itself to fishes, but makes mention of studies in various fields of natural history in which scholars have sought to identify the names bestowed on plants and animals by ancient authors, particularly those of classical antiquity.

Mention is made, at the outset, of work by Professor D'Arcy Wentworth Thompson, author of a Glossary of Greek Birds, and of a translation of Aristotle's *Historia Animalium* (see THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY 5.57-58, 65-66). For an appreciation by a scientist of Professor Thompson's work the author refers to a paper by T. N. Gill, Science, 33 (1911), 730-738. Professor Gill himself had published an article, in 1873, in the American Naturalist 7.458-463, entitled On the Status of Aristotle in Systematic Zoology. In various papers and reviews, also, Professor Gill often discussed the etymologies of names of fishes. See especially Bulletin of the George Washington University 5 (1906).

Reference is next made to a catalogue of the fishes of Greece, by D. S. Jordon and H. A. Hoffmann, published in Proceedings of the American Philosophical Society for 1892.

Reference is then made to works in this field by Cuvier, A. Koraes (Coray), Johannes Müller, Louis Agassiz, Professors Felton and Sophocles, of Harvard University, Nicolaos Christo Apostolides, D. Bikélas, and Ioannos Bouras, etc. Charles Estienne (Stephanus) published, in at least three editions (1537, 1544, 1546), a book entitled *De Latinis et Graecis Nominibus Arborum, Fruticum, Herbarum, Piscium et Avium Liber*. Hosius, in his annotated edition of Decimus Ausonius Magnus, discussed the fishes mentioned by Ausonius in his *Mosella*; the work contains sixteen recognizable descriptions of fishes.

Mr. Eastman declares that a special bibliography would be required to enumerate all the articles that have been written on such subjects as prehistoric effigies of fishes, their representation in Egyptian monuments, ancient Greek vase paintings, and the catacombs of Rome.

In Classical Philology 13.1-13 Professor W. M. Lindsay writes on Bird-Names in Latin Glossaries. On pages 13-22 we have Notes on the Foregoing Article, by Professor Thompson (named above).

C. K.

THE CLASSICAL CLUB OF PHILADELPHIA

The 136th meeting of The Classical Club of Philadelphia was held on Friday evening, February 1, with 32 members present. Professor W. B. McDaniel read a paper entitled *Some Evil Eyes*. No summary can do justice to this fine paper. Professor McDaniel held that the superstitions concerning the evil eye grew up from the fact that in the entire anatomy of man the eye must have been the part which impressed primitive observers as being in some way connected with the inner life or soul. Obvious differences in eyes, especially abnormalities, would be noted, and could readily be given credit for emanation of malign influences through the 'windows of the soul'. The paper was particularly concerned with the presentation of a theory in explanation of the *pupula duplex*. An interesting exposition of the evidence, both classical and ophthalmological, led to the conclusion that *pupula duplex* was to be interpreted literally and not of difference in coloration of the iris, and that an actual duplication of the pupil would naturally be inferred by the ancient observer, from cases of bridge coloboma of the iris, which does not impair vision, is often confined to one eye, and is hereditary to a notable degree.

B. W. MITCHELL, *Secretary*.

A CORRECTION

In these productive days enough time elapses between the writing of an article and its appearance in print to admit of 'further reflection'. I now believe that Caesar (see THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY, 11.106-107) did not have the *ceruchi* in mind, nor yet the *anquinae*, but merely a vague idea (see the last two sentences of the third paragraph on page 107) of ropes *qui antemnas ad malos destinabant*, certainly *not* the halyards.

JOHN C. ROLFE.

THE CLASSICAL ASSOCIATION OF THE ATLANTIC STATES TWELFTH ANNUAL MEETING MAY 3-4, 1918

The Twelfth Annual Meeting of The Classical Association of the Atlantic States will be held at the Drexel Institute, Philadelphia, on Friday and Saturday, May 3-4.